

Attorney Docket No. 1-73990

REMARKS

The courtesy of the Examiner in granting Richard S. MacMillan and the undersigned attorney a personal interview on January 25, 2006 is gratefully acknowledged. During that interview, Claim 21 was discussed in light of the Kato et al. and King et al. references. It was discussed that the Kato et al. reference does not show or suggest the limitations of step c (moving the first and second mold portions toward one another so as to cause the mold assembly to preliminarily deform the first vehicle trim component portion to a preliminary shape), and that neither reference shows or suggests the limitations of step d (subsequently introducing a second vehicle trim component portion into the mold assembly so as to finally deform the first vehicle trim component portion into engagement with the textured surface of the first mold portion to form a vehicle trim component having a surface feature and a final shape) of amended Claim 21.

It was further discussed that the proposal to amend Claim 21 to recite two different staged formation steps (i.e., that step (d) follows step (c)) would clarify the sequence of the steps of the invention and would not raise new issues. As noted in the Interview Summary dated January 26, 2006, the Examiner agreed to consider the clarifying amendment of Claim 21 and noted that such an amendment would define over the art discussed and, subject to further search, would make the case allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory W. Robinette  
Reg. No. 56,117

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC  
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor  
720 Water Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
(419) 255-5900